

FILED IN THE
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Jun 02, 2025

SEAN F. MCAVOY, CLERK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

KARI L. DOHRMAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND
HEALTH SERVICES, WENDY LONG,
DONALD CLINTSMAN

Defendants.

No. 2:24-CV-00359-RLP

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
ALTER OR AMEND JUDGMENT

Before the Court is Plaintiff Kari Dohrman's Motion to Alter or Amend Judgement. ECF No. 32. The matter was submitted for consideration without oral argument. The Court has reviewed the record and files herein and is fully informed. For the reasons discussed below, Ms. Dohrman's Motion to Amend or Alter Judgement, ECF No. 32, is denied.

DISCUSSION

A successful motion for reconsideration must accomplish two goals. First, it must demonstrate some reason why the court should reconsider its prior decision. *Na Mamo O 'Aha 'Ino v. Galiher*, 60 F.Supp.2d 1058, 1059 (D. Haw. 1999) (citation omitted). Second,

ORDER GRANTING MOTION
TO DISMISS - 1

1 a motion for reconsideration must set forth facts or law of a strongly convincing nature to
2 induce the court to reverse its prior decision. *Id.*

3 Under Rule 59(e), it is appropriate to alter or amend a judgment if “(1) the district
4 court is presented with newly discovered evidence, (2) the district court committed clear
5 error or made an initial decision that was manifestly unjust, or (3) there is an intervening
6 change in controlling law.” *Zimmerman v. City of Oakland*, 255 F.3d 734, 740 (9th Cir.
7 2001). Whether to grant a motion for reconsideration is within the sound discretion of the
8 court. *Navajo Nation v. Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakima Nation*, 331 F.3d
9 1041, 1046 (9th Cir. 2003).

10 Mere disagreement with a previous order is an insufficient basis for reconsideration.
11 *Hawaii Stevedores, Inc. v. HT & T Co.*, 363 F. Supp. 2d 1253, 1270 (D. Haw. 2005).
12 Furthermore, reconsideration may not be based on evidence and legal arguments that could
13 have been presented at the time of the challenged decision. *See Kona Enter., Inc. v. Estate*
14 *of Bishop*, 229 F.3d 877, 890 (9th Cir. 2000).

15 As an initial matter, the Court acknowledges the scrivener’s error in the Order
16 Granting Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss the Amended Complaint. *See* ECF No. 30 at 5.
17 The statute of limitations began running on Ms. Dohrman’s claim on October 12, 2021, the
18 date she was notified that DSHS was unable to accommodate her religious exemption.
19 That error, however, does nothing to change the analysis or conclusion of the Court. Ms.
20 Dohrman has not identified an intervening change in the law, submitted any

1 new evidence, or demonstrated the Court committed clear error that was manifestly
2 unjust. *See Hawaii Stevedores*, 363 F. Supp. 2d at 1269. Ms. Dohrman simply disagrees
3 with the Court's prior order which is "an insufficient basis for reconsideration." *Id.* Thus,
4 Ms. Dohrman has not provided any grounds upon which the Court can grant her motion

5 **ACCORDINGLY, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

6 Ms. Dohrman's Motion to alter or Amend Judgment, **ECF No. 32**, is **DENIED**.
7 The District Executive is directed to enter this Order and furnish copies to counsel. This
8 file remains **closed**.

9 **DATED** June 2, 2025

10
11 
12 REBECCA L. PENNELL
13 DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
14
15
16
17
18
19
20